UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,545	01/18/2002	Yanfeng Lu	1565.005US1	9644

21186	7590	10/19/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH
1600 TCF TOWER
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/051,545	LU, YANFENG
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wen-Tai Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *7/26/2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *10-15 and 24-29* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9 and 16-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _1/18/0>_

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-29 are presented for examination, wherein claims 10-15 and 24-29 are

withdrawn from consideration following the previous restriction/election requirements.

2.   Claim 8 is objected to because the terms "the third request" and "the third computing

environment" appear to lack antecedent basis.

3.   Claims 1-9 are objected to because it is unclear what is meant by "concurrent access to

data on cross-computing environments" (see lines 1-2 of claims 1 and 9). That is, it is unclear

whether the data is being concurrently accessed from different computing environments or it is

already stored on different computing environments and made available for "concurrent access".

For the latter it appears to be meaningless to use the word "concurrent" because concurrent

access to the data residing at different environment would necessarily require that the act of

accessing be imposed within a same interval of time (which may be achieved either by

interleaving the activities or by simultaneous execution) [see definition on page 213 in "The

Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms", 7th Edition].

        For prior art rejection in this office action, it is construed that the data is being

concurrently accessed from different computing environments. Correction or clarification in

response to this office action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-9 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jain [U.S. Pat. No. 5434776] in view of Official Notice.

6.   As to claim 1, Jain teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method

for creating multi-lingual computer programs by

dynamically loading message sets from a single message file [e.g., 205, Fig.3], in response to a

user's selection of a preferred language [Abstract].

       Jain does not specifically teach that the multi-lingual computer programs are situated in a

network environment for concurrently providing access (by a plurality of users) so as to access

data on cross-computing environments.

       However, Official Notice is taken that web pages in a WWW server are known to be

concurrently accessible to a plurality of clients who use heterogeneous computing environments

due to the use of platform-independent java programming language or byte-codes in presenting

the web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made that Jain's multi-lingual computer programs may be implemented in a WWW server

using platform-independent language because provisioning data from the Internet environment is

a well-known trend and it may truly service clients of multiple languages [Jain: col.5, lines 54-

60]. Note that, under such circumstances, the server of the multi-lingual computer programs

would be able to: receive a first request for the data from a first computing environment and a

second request for the data from a different computing environment, identify a first message file

to service the requests and concurrently providing access to the first message file in order to load

the data as directed by the first request from the first computing environment and the second

request from the second computing environment [Jain: Abstract; col.1, lines 49-65; col.2, lines

18-36; 301-308, Fig.3; note that both approaches disclosed in col.1, lines 49-65 and col.2, lines

18-36 are applicable to the claimed features here].

7.   As to claims 2-4, Jain further teaches loading the first message file into a memory or a

data store before providing the message file to the requests [Abstract: lines 11-15], wherein the

first message file is identified with a first language associated with the requests [i.e., the system

inherently knows how to associate the user specified language with the message file containing

the required message set].

8.   As to claim 5, Jain further teaches that in providing the first message file, the first

message file is represented in a generic file format [col.3, lines 24-35].

9.   As to claim 6, Jain further teaches that that conventionally different message files are

prepared for each natural language [col.1, lines 49-65]. That is, as an obvious programming

choice and for reason of easing competition for the same message file, a second message file can

be prepared for a third request from a third computing environment for the data requiring a

language different from that of the first and second requests.

10.   As to claims 7-9 and 16, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-

6, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

11.   As to claim 22, Jain does not specifically teach that the system further comprises a single

application programming interface library providing an interface between the set of language

manager executable instructions and the requests from the computing environments.

        However, Official Notice is taken that using API in various application environment is

well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to use an API directly accessible by the operating system of Jain's

computer for providing the interface as claimed because the use of API greatly simplifies the

programming/development effort.

12.   As to claim 23, Jain does not specifically teach that the requests and the message files

are represented in an extensible markup language format.

        However, Official Notice is taken that using XML for web page presentation is well

known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use XML for the requests and the message files are represented in an

extensible markup language format in Jain's system because Jain's message file may include a

plurality of message sets, each associated with a natural language, and it would facilitate the

extraction of any desired message set from the file if the latter is tagged in XML format.

13.   As to claims 17-21, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-6, 16

and 22-23, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6, 16 and

22-23 above.

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

      Guhr et al.   [U.S. Pat. No. 6609246];

      Hanson et al.   [U.S. Pat. No. 6760719];

      Kakei et al.   [U.S. PGPub 20020062396]; and

      Christy et al. [U.S. PGPub 20020002452].

15.   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months

and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will

result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(571) 273-8300 for official communications; and

(571) 273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

October 12, 2005